Modern Physics B, to be published as a "Review" — cond-mat
© World Scientific Publishing Company

arXiv:cond-mat/9407049v1 11 Jul 1994

NON-EQUILIBRIUM COHERENT VORTEX STATES AND SUBHARMONIC GIANT SHAPIRO STEPS IN JOSEPHSON JUNCTION ARRAYS

Daniel Domínguez[a] and Jorge V. José[b,c]
[a] *Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, MS B262, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA*
[b] *Instituut voor Theoretische Fysica, Universiteit Utrecht 3508 TA Utrecht, The Netherlands*
[c] *Department of Physics, Northeastern University Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA*

Submitted June 1994

ABSTRACT

This is a review of recent work on the dynamic response of Josephson junction arrays driven by dc and ac currents. The arrays are modeled by the resistively shunted Josephson junction model, appropriate for proximity effect junctions, including self-induced magnetic fields as well as disorder. The relevance of the self-induced fields is measured as a function of a parameter $\kappa = \lambda_L/a$, with λ_L the London penetration depth of the arrays, and a the lattice spacing. The transition from Type II ($\kappa > 1$) to Type I ($\kappa < 1$) behavior is studied in detail. We compare the results for models with self, self+nearest-neighbor, and full inductance matrices. In the $\kappa = \infty$ limit, we find that when the initial state has at least one vortex-antivortex pair, after a characteristic transient time these vortices unbind and *radiate* other vortices. These radiated vortices settle into a parity-broken, time-periodic, *axisymmetric coherent vortex state* (ACVS), characterized by alternate rows of positive and negative vortices lying along a tilted axis. The ACVS produces subharmonic steps in the current voltage (IV) characteristics, typical of giant Shapiro steps. For finite κ we find that the IV's show subharmonic giant Shapiro steps, even at zero external magnetic field. We find that these subharmonic steps are produced by a whole family of coherent vortex oscillating patterns, with their structure changing as a function of κ. In general, we find that these patterns are due to a break down of translational invariance produced, for example, by disorder or anti-symmetric edge-fields. The zero field case results are in good qualitative agreement with experiments in Nb-Au-Nb arrays.

1. INTRODUCTION

There has been considerable contemporary interest in the study of the dynamic response of two-dimensional Josephson junction arrays (JJA) subjected to external probes [1–27]. This attention has been due in part to recent advances in photolithographic fabrication of these arrays with tailor-made properties. The dynamics of the JJA are described in terms of a large set of coupled, driven, non-linear differential equations. When the current drive has dc+ac components, novel non-equilibrium stationary coherent vortex states may appear in the arrays. Experimentally, giant Shapiro steps (GSS) have been observed in the IV characteristics of proximity-effect

JJA in zero [5] and rational magnetic field frustrations [6]. The frustration, $f = \Phi/\Phi_0$, is defined as the average applied magnetic flux per plaquette, Φ, measured in units of the flux quantum $\Phi_0 = h/2e$. Coherent oscillations of ground state field-induced vortices are believed to be responsible for the existence of the *fractional* GSS when $f = p/q$, with p and q relative primes [6]. This interpretation was successfully verified in numerical simulation modelling of the arrays by a resistively shunted junction (RSJ) model [7,8], as well as from analytic studies [9]. There have also been some experimental [10] and theoretical studies [11,12,13] of the relevance of the geometry of the arrays and the direction of the input current on the generation of fractional GSS. Moreover, the experiments in GSS have encouraged investigations of JJA as coherent radiation sources [14].

Later experiments on Nb-Au-Nb [15,16,17] and Nb-Cu-Nb[6(b)] JJA also showed half-integer GSS (and also some evidence for higher order subharmonic steps) in <u>zero</u> magnetic field. These steps can not be explained within the context of the non-inductive RSJ model, which proved successful in providing an understanding of the $f = p/q$ Shapiro steps.[7,8,9,11,12] In this review we will show that these extra subharmonic steps can be produced by breaking the translational invariance in the arrays.

For example, we found that the addition of disorder can in fact induce extra half-integer steps in zero magnetic field [18,19,20] within the RSJ model, even in the limit when no self-field effects are included. These extra steps were found to be related to a coherent oscillation of current-nucleated vortices. Previously, the nucleation of vortex-antivortex pairs by the defects, induced by an applied dc current, was discussed by Xia and Leath [21]. In our studies we added an ac component to the dc current. The addition of the ac current changes the vortex dynamics in a fundamental way: It leads to the formation of a novel, far from equilibrium, *axisymmetric coherent vortex state* (ACVS). The ACVS corresponds to an oscillating pattern of tilted positive and negative vortex rows which produce the extra half-integer GSS (see Figs 6 and 7). The relevance of the disorder is to act as nucleating centers of vortex pairs, thus providing the relevant initial conditions in the dynamics to generate the ACVS. However, as we shall discuss in this review, what matters in generating the ACVS is to have a mechanism to produce vortex-antivortex pairs (VAP) in the initial conditions since then the dynamics are such that the ACVS is generated in most cases. We will discuss in more detail the properties of the ACVS in Section 3.

Most of the experiments in GSS have been carried out in proximity effect arrays, that have strong temperature-dependent critical currents [6,15,16,17]. In this case self-induced magnetic field (SIMF) effects, which also break translational invariance due to the current induced edge-fields, can be of relevance for the interpretation of the experimental data as was found in Ref. [15]. We have recently developed a dynamic model to study the SIMF effects in Josephson junction arrays[22,23,24]. When applied to the study of dc+ac driven JJA, we found that the fractional GSS observed at nonzero magnetic fields are affected by SIMF effects. There are two extreme regimes

of interest as a function of $\kappa = \lambda_L/a$ in which the underlying microscopic coherent vortex states responsible for the fractional GSS are qualitatively different. Here λ_L is the London penetration depth and a the lattice spacing.

Also, in the case of zero external field we found subharmonic GSS, produced by a family of oscillating coherent vortex states, with different structures as a function of κ [24]. This connects with the ACVS which turns out to be the $\kappa \to \infty$ limit of this family of vortex states.

In this review we present a brief recap of our main results pertaining to the generation of coherent vortex states, mostly in zero external magnetic field. In this way we present a unified view of our understanding of the physics of subharmonic Giant Shapiro Steps at $f = 0$, with zero and finite screening current effects. In our initial calculations[24] we considered the cases where the inductance matrix had diagonal and nearest neighbor components. This approximation has been significantly improved by including the full inductance matrix in the analysis of Refs [25,26,27]. Following the general idea of this improvement we have redone some of our previous calculations including the full inductance matrix and we include a critical comparison between the results of the different approximations.

2. DYNAMICS OF NON-INDUCTIVE JJA

2.1. The Josephson effect

We start by briefly reviewing the essentials of the Josephson effect. A Josephson junction is made of two small superconductors separated by a thin film of non-superconducting material. The two basic equations that describe the physics of the junction are

$$I_J = I_0 \sin(\theta_2 - \theta_1) \ , \tag{1}$$

that gives the supercurrent that flows between the two superconductors, and the voltage drop between them given by

$$V = \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi}\frac{d}{dt}(\theta_2 - \theta_1) \ . \tag{2}$$

Here θ_1, θ_2 are the phases of the Ginzburg-Landau order parameter in superconductors 1 and 2, respectively. The critical current I_0 is the maximum current that can flow through the junction, and $\Phi_0 = h/2e$ is the superconducting quantum of flux. In the presence of a magnetic field the phase difference is replaced by its gauge invariant form, $(\theta_2 - \theta_1) \to (\theta_2 - \theta_1 - \frac{2\pi}{\Phi_0}\int_1^2 \vec{A}\cdot d\vec{l})$, where $\nabla \times \vec{A} = \vec{B}$ is the magnetic field. In real junctions there is always some dissipation. This dissipative effect has been successfully modeled, in the case of proximity effect junctions, by the McCumber-Steward resistively shunted junction (RSJ) model [28]. In the RSJ model, for a dc current biased junction, the total current I that flows in parallel with the ideal Josephson current is

$$I = I_J + V/\mathcal{R} = I_0 \sin(\Delta\theta) + \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi\mathcal{R}}\frac{d\Delta\theta}{dt} \ , \tag{3}$$

where we have used Eqs. (1) and (2) and $\mathcal{R}$ is the RSJ shunt resistance. When I is time-independent, Eq.(3) can be solved analytically. In this case, the time averaged voltage $\langle V\rangle$ as a function of I, which defines the IV curve of the junction, is given by $\langle V\rangle = 0$ when $I < I_0$ and $\langle V\rangle = \mathcal{R}\sqrt{I^2 - I_0^2}$ when $I > I_0$.

When the junction is driven by a time-periodic current $I = I_{dc} + I_{ac}\sin(2\pi\nu t)$, the $\langle V\rangle$ vs I_{dc} curve shows plateaus at the quantized voltages

$$\langle V_n\rangle = n\frac{h\nu}{2e}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \ . \tag{4}$$

These are the Shapiro steps that have allowed very precise measurements of the voltage unit [29]. The central question addressed in this paper is what happens when we couple a large number of Josephson junctions to an array that is then driven by dc+ac currents.

2.2. Josephson junction arrays

A Josephson junction array (JJA) is made of an $N \times N$ network of superconducting islands connected by Josephson currents [1,2]. For example, the square arrays of Benz *et al.* [6] were made of 1000×1000 Nb-Cu-Nb proximity effect junctions with a lattice constant of $a = 10\,\mu m$. A schematic representation of a JJA driven by an external current is shown in Fig. 1.

To model the dynamical behavior of this system we extend the RSJ model to a square JJA network [3]. The current $I_\mu(r)$, along the μ direction between the superconducting islands at sites r and $r+\mu$, with $\mu = \hat{e}_x, \hat{e}_y$, is given by

$$I_\mu(r) = I_0\,\sin(\Delta_\mu\theta(r) - A_\mu(r)) \,+\, \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi\mathcal{R}}\,\frac{d}{dt}\left(\Delta_\mu\theta(r) - A_\mu(r)\right) \,+\, \eta_\mu(r,t)\ , \tag{5}$$

where $\Delta_\mu\theta(r) = \theta(r+\mu) - \theta(r)$. The external magnetic field produces the frustration $f = \frac{Ha^2}{\Phi_0}$, that measures the average number of flux quanta per unit cell, and defined by

$$2\pi f \ = A_x(r) + A_y(r+\hat{e}_x) - A_x(r+\hat{e}_y) - A_y(r) \equiv \Delta_\mu \times A_\mu(r), \tag{6}$$

where the link variable $A_\mu(r) = \frac{2\pi}{\phi_0}\int_r^{r+\mu}\vec{A}\cdot d\vec{l}$. Here, for the moment, we are neglecting the screening currents by assuming that $A_\mu(r)$ is fully determined by the external magnetic field H. This assumption is correct whenever $\lambda_L \gg Na$. For the same reason, $\frac{dA_\mu}{dt}$ can be dropped from Eq. (5) since the magnetic field is constant in time. In Sec. 4 we shall present the full analysis including screening current effects. The effects of temperature are included by adding the Gaussian random variable $\eta_\mu(r,t)$ to the equations of motion with covariance

$$\langle \eta_\mu(r)\,\eta_{\mu'}(r')\rangle = \frac{2kT}{\mathcal{R}}\delta_{r,r'}\delta_{\mu,\mu'}\delta(t-t'). \tag{7}$$

Eq. (5) together with Kirchoff's current conservation law,

$$\Delta_\mu \cdot I_\mu(r) = I_x(r) - I_x(r-x) + I_y(r) - I_y(r-y) = I^{ext}(r), \tag{8}$$

valid at each node, fully define the evolution of the phase $\theta(r,t)$ as a function of time. Here $I^{ext}(r)$ denotes the external current injected at site r. The explicit expression for $\frac{d\theta}{dt}$ derived from these equations is [3]

$$\frac{d\theta(r,t)}{dt} = -\frac{2\pi\mathcal{R}}{\Phi_0}\sum_{r'} G(r,r')\{I^{ext}(r,t) - \Delta_\mu \cdot [I_0 \sin(\Delta_\mu \theta(r',t) - A_\mu(r')) + \eta_\mu(r',t)]\}, \tag{9}$$

with $G(r,r')$ being the two-dimensional lattice Green function which depends on the boundary conditions chosen. Eq.(9) defines the set of coupled nonlinear dynamical equations studied in this paper. In Benz's experiment [6] this would represent a set of 10^6 non-linear coupled oscillators driven by external currents.

Of course, solving this large set of coupled non-linear equations analytically is out of the question. We use then an efficient algorithm to study Eq.(9) numerically. In our simulations the external currents are injected uniformly along the y-direction with $I^{ext}(y=0) = I(t)$ and zero elsewhere. The potentials at $y = N_Y$ are fixed to zero by setting the phases $\theta(y = N_Y + 1) = 0$ (this boundary condition removes a singularity present in the Green function matrix). We choose periodic boundary conditions (PBC) along the x-direction in most calculations, but we have also used free end boundary conditions (FBC) for comparison purposes.

A direct numerical evaluation of Eq. (9) grows as N^4, which is too slow and limits the sizes of the lattices that can be simulated. Overcoming this restriction turns out to be essential for the formation of the ACVS state. We have used instead a very efficient method [18,19,20] based on the use of the Fast Fourier Transform (FFT). Specifically, this involves doing a FFT of Eq. (9) along the x-direction and then solving the resulting tridiagonal matrix equation along the y-direction. This algorithm grows as $N^2 \log N$, which is appreciably faster than the direct method. Eikmans and van Himbergen [4] were the first ones to use the FFT along both the x and y directions to study JJA. Our method shows an improvement over theirs of about 30%. The time integration is carried out using a fixed step fourth order Runge-Kutta (RK) method. Furthermore, at finite temperatures we use an extension of the second order RK method for stochastic differential equations developed by Helfand and Greenside [30]. Typical integration steps used were $\Delta t \nu_0 = 0.01 - 0.1$, with characteristic Josephson frequency $\nu_0 = \frac{2\pi\mathcal{R}I_0}{\Phi_0}$.

2.3. Periodic square arrays and giant Shapiro steps

For ordered arrays, Eq.(9) is invariant against the transformations

$$f \to f + n \quad \text{and} \quad f \to -f. \tag{10}$$

with n an integer. In this case it is enough to analyze the properties of the model in the interval $f = [0, 1/2]$. The phase vortex excitations that can appear in the JJA are defined by

$$\sum_R \quad [\Delta_\mu \theta(r) - A_\mu(r)] = 2\pi(n(R) - f), \tag{11}$$

where the sum is over the plaquette R and the gauge invariant phase differences, $\Delta_\mu\theta(r) - A_\mu(r)$, are restricted to the interval $[-\pi, \pi]$. Therefore, $n(R)$ is an integer that gives the vorticity at plaquette R. In zero field and at finite temperatures vortices play a central role in triggering the Berezinskii-Kosterlitz-Thouless phase transition [31]. For fractional frustrations $f = p/q$, with p and q relative primes, the ground states of the arrays consist of superlattices of field-induced vortices with unit cell of size $q \times q$ [32]. These states lead to non-monotonic behavior of the magnetoresistance and $T_c(f)$ studied both experimentally and theoretically[1,32,2].

We can calculate the experimentally measurable IV characteristics from the solutions to Eq. (9). The calculations give the time-averaged total voltage drop $\langle V \rangle$ per row in the array as a function of the applied dc current. For periodic arrays, the $f = 0$ dynamic response of the model is equivalent to the superposition of N individual Josephson junctions along the direction of the current[3] for the total current flows along the y-direction. The model behavior is that of N_x rows with N_y junctions in series. Thus, when the $I_{ac} = 0$, the IV characteristics are simply given by the one-junction result multiplied by N_y. The same is true in a JJA when $f = 0$ and $I(t) = I_{dc} + I_{ac}\sin(2\pi\nu_a t)$, leading to *giant* Shapiro steps at voltages [5]:

$$V_n = N_y \frac{nh\nu}{2e}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \ . \tag{12}$$

The N_y factor is important in the possible practical applications of JJA. The symmetry that allows us to separate the $N_x \times N_y$ array into N_x independent rows in series is broken when the external magnetic field is nonzero. No exact analytic solution to Eq. (9) that gives the IV characteristics is known in this case. It was first found experimentally [6] that there are fractional GSS at voltages

$$V_{n,q} = \frac{N_y}{q} \frac{nh\nu}{2e}, \quad n, q = 1, 2, 3, \dots \ , \tag{13}$$

when $f = p/q$. These fractional steps were explained as due to the collective oscillations between different $f = p/q$ vortex ground state configurations [6,7,8,9]. The vortex-superlattice oscillates in synchrony with the ac current with frequency ν/q. We have in fact seen these ground state oscillations in animations produced with solutions to Eq. (9).

In the zero field case one could expect that by breaking translational invariance, which allows the reduction of the 2-D array into effectively 1-D rows, one may get extra subharmonic GSS even in zero magnetic field. One can break translational invariance by simply adding disorder to the array. This is the topic of the next section. Later, in Sec. 5, we will see that current induced magnetic fields also break translational invariance.

2.4. Defect nucleated vortex pairs.

We introduce disorder in a square JJA by displacing the lattice sites radially away from their periodic positions by a distance $\delta < 1$, and then choosing the

angle from a uniform probability distribution in $[0, 2\pi]$. We assume that the critical currents and shunt resistances are all the same and equal to I_0 and $\mathcal{R}$'s, respectively. This means that the disorder is only evident when the link variables $A_\mu(r) \neq 0$. Adding one defect to the array affects only the four A_μ's connecting the bonds linked to the displaced lattice site. Varying f can be seen as increasing the deformation or disorder in the lattice, since the A_μ's are proportional to the external field. When we take $f = n$ an integer, because of the local periodicity of the equations of motion with respect to f, only the plaquettes around the defect will be modified by the presence of the field. The n value chosen will represent the "strength" of the defect. As we shall discuss later the specific nature of the disorder will not be important in producing an ACVS. For example, the ACVS also appears when we cut bonds with $f = 0$.

Leath and Xia [21] studied the response of a JJA with a rectangular defect and in the presence of a constant dc current. They found that there is a tendency to create a vortex-antivortex pair (VAP) pinned to the defect for $I_{dc} \neq 0$. When the external current is larger than the critical current of the array, I_c, the Lorentz force acting on the VAP is enough to break them apart and they can move away from the defect. As they move along the direction perpendicular to the external current, they produce a dissipative Faraday voltage that leads to a nonzero resistance in the array. A larger number of VAP's is generated when $I_{dc} \gg I_c$, leading to rather complex vortex motions in the array.

In Fig. 2 we show an example of this situation for the kind of topological defect we defined above. We show the vortex distribution $n(R)$ for a 40×40 array, which was the typical size studied, although we will discuss results for larger lattices as well. For $I < I_c$ we see a VAP pinned at the defect. When $I > I_c$, vortices and antivortices move away from the defect as found in Ref. [21].

3. AXISYMMETRIC COHERENT VORTEX STATES (ACVS)

3.1. IV characteristics

In this section we discuss the IV characteristics of JJA with the type of defect introduced in the previous section and driven by a current

$$I^{ext} = I_{dc} + I_{ac} \sin(2\pi\nu t). \tag{14}$$

Let us start with a JJA with only one defect. Later we will discuss what happens when the JJA has more defects.

In Fig. 3(a) we show the IV characteristics for a periodic JJA. In calculating the IV characteristics as we vary I_{dc}, we take the final phase configurations of the preceding current value as initial conditions for the next one. In Fig. 3(a) we see the expected integer GSS (Eq. 12), which are identical to those obtained with one Josephson junction, except for a factor of N_y. In Fig. 3(b) we show the results for the IV of a 40×40 square lattice with one defect located at the center of the array.

We can clearly distinguish the new half-integer steps in the IV curve at voltages

$$V_{n/2} = \frac{n}{2}\frac{N_y h\nu}{2e}; \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \ , \tag{15}$$

in addition to the expected rounding of the usual integer steps due to the presence of disorder. It turns out that the precise location of the defect on the lattice has no effect on the nature of the final stationary state nor on the appearance of the half-integer steps. The half-integer steps are found to be hysteretic. This is seen in Fig. 3 (c) where we show a blow-up of the 1/2-step region, but for an 80×80 lattice. For the 1/2-step we can define two critical currents, I_c^+ when increasing the current, and I_c^- when decreasing it. As usual, the size of the hysteresis loop is history-dependent. For $I > I_c^+$, the 1/2-step is reversible, and it can be reached independent of the initial conditions. For $I_c^- < I < I_c^+$ the response depends directly on the initial conditions. Note the appearance of a 2/3-step at

$$V_{2/3} = \frac{2}{3}\frac{N_y h\nu}{2e}, \tag{16}$$

which was not clearly evident in the 40×40 lattice calculation. The 2/3-step is also found to be hysteretic. We will discuss this step in more detail in Sec. 3.3.

An important property of the half-integer steps is that they are not clearly visible for lattice sizes smaller than about 18×18. We have then carried out a finite size analysis of the 1/2-step width [18,20] and found that there is a minimum critical size $N_c \sim 16$, above which we start to see indications of the existence of the 1/2-step. The 1/2-step width reaches an asymptotic plateau for lattices larger than about 32×32. We believe that the need to have a minimum lattice size to see the 1/2-step is related to the specific nature of the ACVS structures that needed to be stable in the non-equilibrium stationary state. We discuss this point further in the next section.

We have also calculated the IV's for JJA with free boundary conditions. We find that the subharmonic steps are also present, but the lattice sizes needed to see the ACVS are still larger. This is easy to understand since the boundary has more of a perturbing effect in smaller lattices. As the lattice size increases the shape of the subharmonic steps approaches the sharpness of the ones found when using PBC [19,20]. Therefore, we conclude that the boundary conditions are not essential for the existence of the ACVS.

Once we had identified the subharmonic steps due to the presence of defects we studied their quantitative properties. Following the approach used for one junction, we began the characterization of the half-integer Shapiro steps by studying their width-dependence on the frequency ν, the ac current I_{ac}, the amount of disorder and temperature. In Fig. 4(a) we show the dependence of the 1/2-step width as a function of ν with $I_{ac} = I_0$. Here we note that there is a frequency window for which the 1/2-step is clearly visible and has a well defined maximum at $\nu_{max} \approx 0.22\,\nu_0$ [33]. The width of the frequency window is $\Delta\nu \equiv \nu_+ - \nu_- \sim 0.043\nu_0 - 0.4\nu_0$. Outside this frequency window the step width is essentially zero.

In the one junction case the step width as a function of I_{ac} goes like $\Delta I_n = 2I_0 J_n(\frac{2e\mathcal{R}I_{ac}}{h\nu})$, with J_n the Bessel function of integer order [34]. In Fig. 4(b) we show the oscillatory behavior of $\Delta I_{1/2}$ as a function of I_{ac}, for $\nu = 0.1\,\nu_0$, and with one defect. The oscillations do not appear to fit the expected Bessel function form but the data is not good enough to make a definitive statement. Even more important is the fact that we appear to find a critical value for I_{ac} above which the step appears [35].

We need to consider temperature effects to make comparisons with the experimental data. We have then studied the stability of the 1/2-step as a function of temperature [18,19,20]. We found that the 1/2-step gets rounded as temperature increases and the hysteresis step width is reduced. The 1/2-step tends to disappear for a relatively low temperature $T > 0.04\Phi_0 I_0/2\pi k_B$, which is small compared to the BKT critical temperature ($\sim O(1)$) [31]. This is consistent with the fact that the width of the 1/2-step is small when compared to the critical current of the array.

We also found that when we added more disorder, by increase the number of lattice sites displaced from their periodic positions in the array, the half-steps are still there but their hysteretic properties get quantitatively modified[19,20]. Even when all the lattice sites are deformed, the 1/2-integer step is still there, but it is more rounded and with the hysteresis loop reduced in size. We conclude that a completely distorted lattice is not enough to destroy the extra 1/2-steps. However, a study of the half-integer steps as a function of the strength of the disorder [20] shows that there is a critical value above which the 1/2-steps do disappear. This value coincides with the disorder strength above which there is a plastic flow of vortices in dc driven JJA [36].

3.2. Coherent Vortex oscillating states

In the previous section we described the conditions under which extra subharmonic steps appear in the IV characteristics in the $\kappa = \infty$ limit. Here we want to discuss the physical origin of these steps based on a microscopic analysis of the vortex dynamics.

A useful quantity to look at is the spectral function

$$S(\nu) = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} |\frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau V(t)e^{i2\pi\nu t}dt|^2 \tag{17}$$

as a function of frequency ν. We calculated $S(\nu)$ and found, as would have been expected, that it shows resonances at frequencies $n\nu/2$ for the 1/2-steps [19,20]. The resonances at the 1/2-step indicate that there is an underlying coherent vortex oscillatory state with twice the period of the ac current. These resonances only exist for currents right on the steps, fractional and integer, while for other values of I_{dc} there is a broad band spectrum in $S(\nu)$.

As mentioned in Section 2.3 the presence of *fractional* giant Shapiro steps, found when $f = p/q$, is explained in terms of coherent vortex oscillations between different lattice ground states. At zero field and at $T = 0$ there are no vortices in a periodic

array. However, as we showed in Sec. 2.4 for the dc case, the presence of defects can produce current-induced vortices. Therefore, to further study the vortex dynamics we calculated the total absolute number of vortices in the array

$$N_a(t) = \sum_R |n(R,t)|, \tag{18}$$

as well as the total vorticity

$$N_T(t) = \sum_R n(R,t) = N_+ + N_-, \tag{19}$$

where $n(R,t)$ was defined in Eq. (11). We started by choosing I_{dc} within the reversible part of the 1/2-step. Typical results for $N_a(t)$ and $N_T(t)$ in the single-defect case are shown in Fig. 5. From this figure we can identify two characteristic times t_d and t_{ACVS}, the *dissociation time* and the *ACVS time*, respectively. For $t < t_d$ there is a vortex pair (as in the dc case, Fig. 2) but with its $\pm$ polarity oscillating in phase with the current. The size of the VAP increases with time due to the oscillating Lorentz force felt by the vortices. At t_d the vortex-dipole breaks up and the vortices move away from the defect. After that time the number of vortices increase steeply. There is a novel mechanism that generates vortex pairs from the moving ones. This kind of vortex "radiation" phenomenon appears to be catalyzed by the presence of the oscillating field due to the presence of the dc+ac current. The vortex motions in this intermediate phase do not follow a regular pattern. In the one-defect case the transient state has a left-right antisymmetry about an axis centered about the defect and along the current direction. This antisymmetry is reflected in N_T, which is exactly zero in this time interval. After the t_{ACVS} time the antisymmetry is broken, and an *axisymmetric coherent vortex state* (ACVS) starts to form. This is seen in the $N_a(t)$ curve as periodic variation of the number of vortices, and in $N_T(t)$ as fluctuations about zero.

In Fig. 6(a) we show the distribution of vortices and antivortices in the ACVS state. The vortex configurations are formed by rows of vortices of alternating sign lying along a tilted axis with an angle of about 27° measured clockwise with respect to the x-axis. The rows are separated along the x-axis by a distance of about $N_x/2$. In total there are $N_y/2$ vortices and $N_y/2$ antivortices. This state oscillates in sign in phase with the ac current. After a time $1/\nu$ the vortex rows interchange their signs, and after $2/\nu$ they are back to the previous vortex state. Therefore, the vortex configurations change periodically in time with a period twice that of the ac current. During most of the time the vortex patterns correspond to one or the other possible ACVS configuration. The change of sign of the vortex rows happens in a very short time, corresponding to the peaks in the $N_a(t)$ curve of Fig. 5(a). At that instant in time the vortices and antivortices appear to cross from one row to the other. The collisions between them produce additional vortices and antivortices, which annihilate each other rapidly before a new ACVS of opposite sign is formed.

The ACVS remains stable for the largest times considered ($10^4/\nu$). To study the stability of the ACVS, we turned off the ac or the dc currents at times t_{off}

as shown in Fig. 5. In both cases, after turning off one of the currents with the other one still on, the ACVS collapses into the initial VAP pinned state. The total vortex number decreases via direct vortex-antivortex annihilations. However, the process of annihilation is much slower when the ac current is still on while the dc current is turned off. This means that the ac current strongly affects the collisions between vortices by actually delaying the direct annihilation of vortices by antivortices. Within a 1/2-step the ACVS is also stable against small changes in the frequency and magnitude of the ac current and the frequency.

A remarkable aspect of the ACVS state is that its structure, characterized by its angle, the distance between vortex rows and the number of vortices, appears to be a very robust non-equilibrium fixed point attractor of the dynamics. For example, we also have considered the cases when two, three, or all the lattice sites are disordered. We find that in these cases, although the quantitative values of the transients and the number of disorder-induced vortices is different, the stationary oscillatory state is essentially an ACVS. Moreover, there are parameter windows for the ac current, frequency, defect "strength" f and temperature, where the ACVS shows the same vortex pattern. The periodically oscillating vortex pattern is also the same for higher order $n/2$-steps with period $(n+1)/\nu$. However, we needed larger lattices, at least 64×64, to "fit in" an ACVS when the boundary conditions were changed to FBC, although the ACVS patterns appeared slightly "distorted" from the ones obtained using PBC. We conclude that boundaries can affect the coherence of the state, but for large enough lattices the ACVS forms and is stable.

We note that the ACVS can form in the two possible broken-symmetry states with angular orientations either 27° or its complimentary $180^\circ - 27^\circ$. Furthermore, we found that for large rectangular lattices (when $N_y >> N_x$) the two broken-symmetry states can coexist with each other [19,20].

At this point we wanted to know what essential ingredients are needed to nucleate an ACVS. A naive approach would suggest that the steady state is reached when the rate of vortex generation by the defect is equal to the rate of vortex annihilation. However, we found that most vortices were generated away from the defect during the transient time ($t_d < t < t_{ACVS}$). If disorder was essential in the formation of the ACVS, then when we switch off the disorder the state should collapse. However, the ACVS remained stable when we removed the defects by setting $f = 0$. We also tried switching off the defects for times $t_d < t < t_{ACVS}$ and the ACVS is still stable. On the other hand, for times $t < t_d$ the state collapses after we set $f = 0$. This suggested that once we have a large enough VAP, so that the vortices can not annihilate each other, the VAPs are then capable of generating a whole ACVS by themselves. This proves that what is essential in the formation of an ACVS is the "radiation" mechanism that produces and annihilates VAPs during their collisions. We also checked that if we start with a VAP in an ordered lattice, the ACVS is generated for the same I_{dc}, I_{ac} and ν as when a defect was present. It appears then that:

Any physical mechanism (not only from disorder) that is capable of producing a vortex-antivortex pair sufficiently far apart, can nucleate an ACVS in a two-dimensional JJA.

3.3. Higher order ACVS

We already mentioned that when increasing the size of the lattice there are new subharmonic steps in the IV characteristics. This is shown in Fig. 3 (c), where an additional voltage step appears at

$$V_{2/3} = \frac{2}{3}\frac{N_y h\nu}{2e}, \tag{20}$$

for a lattice of size of 80×80. We also found that this step appears clearly after a minimum lattice size, which is about $N_c \sim 70$. We found that the time evolution of the vortex patterns responsible for the 2/3-step also has the general structure of an ACVS, but now oscillating with period $3/\nu$. This state becomes stable only after a very complex transient with a longer t_{ACVS} than the one found in the 1/2-step case. In Fig. 6(b) we show the stationary vortex distributions for a current within the 2/3-step. It consists of rows of vortices (and antivortices) lying along a tilted axis with the same angle of about 27° with respect to the x-axis and separated by a distance of $N_x/3$ along the x-direction. The total number of vortices is now $\frac{3}{2}N_y$. To have period 3 there is one row of vortices and two of antivortices. They interchange positions in synchrony with the ac-current. The total vorticity is still zero on the average, for the rows with vortices have double the density of those with antivortices. This implies that there may still be more possibilities for complicated ACVS-like oscillating patterns with the broken symmetry states in larger lattices. We note, however, that the step-width of the 2/3-step is smaller than that for the 1/2-steps. One can speculate that the higher subharmonic states possibly present in larger lattices will have step-widths that will tend to zero as the size of the lattice tends to infinity. The IV characteristics could then have a Devil's staircase type of structure.

3.4. Experimental observations of subharmonic GSS at $f = 0$

In the previous sections we have seen that fractional giant Shapiro steps, produced by oscillating collective vortex states, can be generated either by having a fractional frustration $f = p/q$ in periodic arrays or by specific initial conditions that contain a vortex-antivortex pair (VAP) in the $f = 0$ case. There we showed that the physical origin of the two types of collective vortex states is physically very different. These two scenarios for producing GFSS do not appear to be able to explain the experiments that show Shapiro steps at fractions $n/2$ and $n/3$ in *zero magnetic field* [15,16,17,6(b)]. Since these subharmonic steps were not observed in single Nb-Au-Nb junctions[37,15,16], they must be due to the non-linear coupling between junctions in the two dimensional arrays. Therefore, they cannot be understood within the RSJ model given in Eq.(9), because in the $f = 0$ case the dynamics of a periodic array

is reduced to that of an effective single Josephson junction. However, as we discussed in the previous section, the ACVS produces subharmonic steps in zero field within the RSJ model, provided there is at least one VAP in the initial conditions. Therefore, an ACVS could be a good candidate to explain the experimental results observed in Ref. [15,16,17,6(b)]. However, these experiments were done on (nominally) ordered arrays. More importantly, as it was recognized in the experimental papers, the critical currents in the SNS samples were large and therefore self-induced magnetic fields, not included in the RSJ model, could play a role in explaining these extra steps [15,16].

The experiments in GSS have been carried out, for the most part, in proximity effect arrays that have strong temperature-dependent critical currents [6,15,16,17]. A carefully controlled narrow temperature range was studied experimentally in order to minimize the effect of the self-induced magnetic fields (SIMF) [6] . For example, in Benz's experiments the value of the London penetration depth quoted in reference 4(b) is $\lambda_L(T_c = 3.5K) = 280$ (this estimate is obtained from using Pearl's formula, which is strictly valid in the continuum limit). Note that $\lambda_L/a < N = 1000$, which is in principle out of the regime of validity of the model given in Eq.(9) (e.g. $\lambda_L \gg Na$). λ_L decreased further when the temperature was lowered below T_c. Moreover, when going down to $T = 2.5K$, a zero-field 1/2-step was observed by Benz [6(b)], with a value for $\lambda_L = 2.5a$, which is certainly far from the region of applicability of the RSJ model. Also, in the experiments by H. C. Lee at al. [15] a value of $\lambda_L = 2.2a$ was quoted.

3.5. Antisymmetric edge magnetic fields

The discussion given above suggests that the SIMF can be essential for the understanding of the experimental data. In fact, it was found in the experiments of Ref.[15] that the currents flowing in the array (at $f = 0$) produce an induced antisymmetric magnetic field distribution in the arrays. The magnetic field is stronger at the edges of the array along the direction parallel to the external current, with magnitude $B_{edge} \approx +MI^{ext}/a^2$ at one edge, and $B_{edge} \approx -MI^{ext}/a^2$ at the other. In the center of the array the magnitude of B tends to be small. Here M is the mutual inductance between plaquettes in the array. Note that these current induced magnetic fields, due to their antisymmetric nature, *also break translational invariance in the JJA*.

A phenomenological way of trying to mimic the *edge-fields*, is to add them as boundary conditions to the non-inductive RSJ model. We have done numerical studies adding the edge-fields with flux $\Phi = \gamma I^{ext}\Phi_0$ at one edge of the array and $\Phi = -\gamma I^{ext}\Phi_0$ at the other[20,24]. Again we found extra 1/2-steps in the IV characteristics for all γ parameter values studied ($0.05 < \gamma < 2$), just as we found before in arrays with defects. When looking at the animation of the vortex patterns responsible for these steps we found the same type of ACVS as discussed in the previous section. An specific example is shown in shown in Fig. 7. This pattern oscillates with period $2/\nu$ when the current is in the 1/2-step. Looking at the

transient that produces this ACVS, we found that the edge-fields produce VAPs, and then the dc+ac currents proceed to help nucleate the ACVS state, although the transient is longer and more complicated than in the case with defects.

This result is in agreement with the conclusion we reached at the end of Sec. 3.2 in that what is needed to produce an ACVS is simply a mechanism to initially nucleate VAPs in the array. These are the initial conditions that appear to lead to the ACVS. Note that in the calculations described here we used FBC.

4. DYNAMICS OF INDUCTIVE JJA

We just discussed how an ACVS can be produced by artificially imposing the edge magnetic fields at the boundaries of an array described by the RSJ equations of motion. However, the real antisymmetric magnetic fields measured experimentally must be produced dynamically from Faraday's law. In order to properly take into account screening current effects we must solve self-consistently the flux and phase dynamical equations. This is the goal of this section.

Here and in Sec. 5, we will describe our results from including the SIMF at different levels of approximation, together with a qualitative comparison to the experimental results. As mentioned in the introduction, our initial approximate calculations[24] to the inductance matrix were recently superseded by including the full inductance matrix in the calculations[26]. Here we present our way of including the full inductance matrix into the calculation, which differs in the details from the approach followed by Phillips et al., but that it leads to similar physical results. We also present a comparison of our results obtained within the different inductance matrix approximations.

4.1. Self-consistent JJA dynamical equations

We start by noticing that the current along the bonds of the lattice, $I_\mu(r,t)$, is still given by Eq.(5). The difference comes only from the fact that in this case

$$\frac{dA_\mu(r,t)}{dt} \neq 0,$$

where the vector potential $A_\mu(r,t)$ is now related to the **total** magnetic flux $\Phi(R,t)$ at plaquette R:

$$\frac{2\pi\Phi(R,t)}{\Phi_0} = A_x(r,t) + A_y(r+\hat{e}_x,t) - A_x(r+\hat{e}_y,t) - A_y(r,t) = \Delta_\mu \times A_\mu(r,t)\,. \quad (21)$$

In this case we see that the total $\Phi(R,t)$ now depends on the flux generated by the external field $\Phi_x = Ha^2 = f\Phi_0$, plus the magnetic flux induced by all the currents flowing in the array. Specifically we can write

$$\Phi(R,t) = \Phi_x(R) + \sum_{r',\mu'} \Gamma(R,r',\mu') I_{\mu'}(r',t)\,, \quad (22)$$

where $\Gamma(R,r',\mu')$ is a matrix that explicitly depends on the geometries of the array and the junctions. It is convenient to write Eq. (22) only in terms of dual or

plaquette variables. From the current conservation condition given in Eq. (8), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} I_x(r,t) &= J(R,t) - J(R-\hat{e}_y,t) \\ I_y(r,t) &= J(R-\hat{e}_x,t) - J(R,t) + I_{ext}(t) \ , \end{aligned}$$

with $J(R,t)$ the plaquette's current, defined to be positive for currents flowing in the anticlockwise direction. We rewrite these equations in a short-hand notation,

$$I_\mu(r) = \Delta_\mu \times J(R) + \delta_{\mu,y} I_{ext} \ , \tag{23}$$

indicating that the external current is only applied along the y-direction. In terms of the plaquette variables Eq. (22) can be written as,

$$\Phi(R,t) = \Phi_x(R) + \sum_{R'} L(R,R') J(R',t) + E(R) I_{ext}(t) \tag{24}$$

where

$$L(R,R') = \Delta_{\mu'} \times \Gamma(R,r',\mu') \tag{25}$$

is the inductance matrix of the array and we defined

$$E(R) I_{ext}(t) = \sum_{r'} \Gamma(R,r',\hat{e}_y) I_{ext}(t) \ . \tag{26}$$

This term gives the magnetic flux induced by the applied external currents which is antisymmetric along the x-direction. These magnetic fields have maximum amplitude at the edges of the array and decrease towards its center, and thus they are called "edge magnetic fields". For example, for a current sheet they are given by,

$$E(R_x,R_y) \approx \frac{\mu_0 a}{2\pi} \ln(\frac{N_x a - R_x}{R_x}),$$

with $R_x \in [a,(N_x-1)a]$. This result is a good approximation for the actual value of $E(R)$ in JJA [23]. Note that the magnitude of E depends directly on the size of the array, and it decreases at the center of the lattice as lattice size grows. In the limit $|\frac{N_x a}{2} - R_x| \ll N_x a$, $E(R_x) \approx \frac{2\mu_0}{\pi N_x}(\frac{N_x a}{2} - R_x)$ at the center of the array. We note that there are other ways of separating and interpreting the different contributions in Eq.(24), as in Ref. [26].

We note that to write down the set of dynamical equations for $A_\mu(r,t)$ and $\theta(r,t)$ we need to fix a gauge. In the Coulomb gauge, $\Delta_\mu \cdot A_\mu(r,t) = 0$, and from the combination of Eqs. (5), (21), (23) and (24) we obtain again Eq. (9) for $\theta(r,t)$, but now complemented by the following dynamical equation for the flux

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Phi(R,t)}{dt} &= \mathcal{R} I_0 \Delta_\mu \times \sin(\Delta_\mu \theta(r,t) - A_\mu(r,t)) \\ &+ \mathcal{R}\Delta_\mu^2 \left[\sum_{R'} L^{-1}(R,R') \left(\Phi(R',t) - \Phi_x - E(R') I_{ext} \right) \right] + \xi(R,t) \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

with the noise function,

$$\xi(R,t) = \mathcal{R}\Delta_\mu \times \eta_\mu(r,t).$$

The complete dynamics of the array is now governed by Eq. (9) and Eq. (27). These equations have to be solved for $\theta(r,t)$ and $\Phi(R,t)$ self-consistently, where each one of these variables has its own characteristic frequency. We can define typical values for these frequencies from linearizing the Josephson term in Eq.(27)[22] giving, $\nu_\theta = 2\pi\mathcal{R}I_c/\Phi_0 = \nu_0$, and $\nu_\Phi = \mathcal{R}/\mu_0 a$. To carry out an efficient numerical integration of the equations in time it is essential to take into account the relative magnitudes of the two relaxation times. In the extreme Type II regime $\nu_\Phi \gg \nu_\theta$ and the fast decaying variables are the fluxes while the θ's are slow, with the opposite happening when $\nu_\Phi \ll \nu_\theta$. This situation is typical of 'stiff' problems in ordinary differential equations, which are notoriously difficult to treat analytically and even numerically, for they lead to singular perturbations [38]. On the other hand, since the equations of motion are gauge invariant we can use this symmetry to find the most appropriate gauge to solve the problem. It turns out, however, that a fixed gauge does not allow us to efficiently solve the equations for all values of ν_Φ/ν_θ. In the $\nu_\Phi/\nu_\theta \gg 1$ limit, the extreme Type II regime, a convenient gauge to choose is the Coulomb gauge. We have implemented an algorithm that works in this case. Our discussion here will concentrate on the intermediate regime $0.05 \leq \nu_\Phi/\nu_\theta \leq 20$, where the stiffness problem is less severe. Furthermore, this is the regime considered in the experiments of Ref. [15,16,17], and it corresponds to the temperature range, $[1.5\,K, 2.6\,K]$ in Benz's experiments [6(b)]. In this ν_Φ/ν_θ range it is more convenient to use the temporal gauge to efficiently solve the equations. This gauge has been used extensively in the past [39] and more recently[40] within the context of a JJA model of ceramic high temperature superconductors. This gauge entails replacing

$$(\Delta_\mu\theta(r,t) - A_\mu(r,t)) \rightarrow \Psi_\mu(r,t).$$

In terms of Ψ_μ the Langevin dynamical equations of motion read,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi\mathcal{R}}\frac{d\Psi_\mu(r)}{dt} &= -\frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi}\Delta_\mu \times \sum_{R'} L^{-1}(R,R')(\Delta_\mu \times \Psi_\mu(r') + 2\pi f + \frac{2\pi}{\Phi_0}E(R')I_{ext}) \\ &\quad -I_0 \sin\Psi_\mu(r) + \delta_{\mu,y}I_{ext} - \eta_\mu(r,t)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

This system of equations describes the same physical dynamical evolution as Eqs. (9) and (27), (note that in both gauges there are $2N^2$ dynamical variables). Of course, we have to take free boundary conditions in order to allow the internal and external magnetic fields to relax to their correct stationary values. This implies that relatively large lattices have to be simulated to get the physically correct asymptotic behavior.

4.2. Inductance matrix models

A general analytic expression for the inductance matrix $L(R,R')$, valid for arbitrary (R,R') and array geometry, is not known. However, we can learn a lot about

the main qualitative properties of the array from the asymptotics of $L(R,R')$ and its general symmetries. We start by writing the standard definition of the $\Gamma(R,r',\mu')$ matrix defined in Eq (22)

$$\Gamma(R,r',\mu') = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi}\frac{1}{S_R S_{r'\mu'}}\oint_R \int_{r'\mu'} \frac{d\vec{l}_R \cdot d\vec{l}_{r'\mu'}\, dS_R dS_{r'\mu'}}{|\vec{\rho}_R - \vec{\rho}_{r'\mu'}|} \ . \tag{29}$$

Here S_R, and $S_{r'\mu'}$ are the cross sectional areas of the junctions in the plaquette R and the branches r',μ', respectively (the integrals are along the links between superconducting islands). This expression for Γ makes explicit its dependence on the geometrical characteristics of the array and the junctions. Using Eq (25), the representation of $L(R,R')$ based on Eq (29), gives

$$L(R,R') = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi}\frac{1}{S_R S_{R'}}\oint_R \oint_{R'} \frac{d\vec{l}_R \cdot d\vec{l}_{R'}\, dS_R dS_{R'}}{|\vec{\rho}_R - \vec{\rho}_{R'}|} \ . \tag{30}$$

This expression depends on the particular shape of the junctions and geometry of the JJA. Here we note that the general qualitative properties of the response of the array to external probes will not depend on the detailed form of the full inductance matrix. The important properties of $L(R,R')$ are that $L(R,R')$ is positive, its non-diagonal elements are negative and decrease rapidly at long distances, plus the condition $\sum_{R'=-\infty}^{\infty} L(R,R') = 0$ must be fulfilled (because of the continuity of the flux lines).

Here we will assume that the JJA has square lattice geometry and that each bond is made of cylindrical wires: Then one can obtain $L(R,R')$, in principle, from a direct integration of Eq (30). This is not exactly the geometry of the arrays considered experimentally, and we will discuss how this approximation may affect the final results.

First we note that for large distances we can approximate the lattice problem by its continuum limit leading to

$$L(R,R')_{|R-R'|\gg a} \approx -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi}\frac{a^4}{|R-R'|^3} \ , \tag{31}$$

which corresponds to the field of a three-dimensional magnetic dipole produced by a current loop. Note that the long range behavior is always given by Eq. (31) (since it is independent of the particular shape of the junctions).

The short distance properties of the $L(R,R')$ matrix depend more explicitly on the specific geometry of the junctions. Here we take the results of an explicit asymptotic evaluation of $L(R,R')$ obtained by direct integration of Eq. (30) for a square network of cylindrical wires[41,27]. For example, the local behavior of $L(R,R')$ is found to be given by

$$\begin{aligned} L(R,R) &= L_0 = \tfrac{\mu_0 a}{2\pi}\left[8\ln\tfrac{2a}{r(1+2\sqrt{2})} + 8\sqrt{2} - 14\right] \\ L(R,R\pm\mu) &= -M = -\tfrac{1}{4}L_0 + \tfrac{\mu_0 a}{2\pi}0.141875 \\ L(R,R\pm e_x \pm e_y) &= -M_{11} = -\tfrac{\mu_0 a}{2\pi}0.4\ldots \ , \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where a is the lattice constant and r is the radius of the wires. For the JJA we take $2r$ as the typical width of the junctions. From now on we normalize the inductance matrix by $\mu_0 a$, or $\Lambda(R,R') = L(R,R')/\mu_0 a$, and $\Lambda_0 = L_0/\mu_0 a$, and $\mathcal{M} = M/\mu_0 a$. We use $a/r = 10$, which is a typical value for arrays made with SNS junctions[15], for which, $\Lambda_0 = 1.13...$, $\mathcal{M} = 0.14...$, $\mathcal{M}_{11} = 0.064...$.

We have considered three different models for the inductance matrix:

Model A is the simplest approximation that incorporates screening effects including only the diagonal or self-inductance contribution to $L(R,R')$, i.e.

$$L(R,R') = \Lambda_0 \mu_0 a \delta_{R,R'}. \tag{33}$$

This approximation leads to null edge magnetic fields, $E(R) = 0$ for all R. Model A has been used in the past by Nakajima and Sawada [42] to study vortex motion, and by Majhofer *et al* [40] to model irreversible properties of ceramic superconductors. This model is good when trying to describe the properties of bulk samples, and three-dimensional arrays[43].

Model B improves model A in that it includes the nearest neighbor mutual inductance contributions:

$$L(R,R') = \Lambda_0 \mu_0 a \delta_{R,R'} - \mathcal{M} \mu_0 a \delta_{R,R'\pm\mu}. \tag{34}$$

In this case the edge-fields as defined above are explicitly included. The corresponding magnetic fields at the boundaries are given by $E(\text{left boundary}) = \mathcal{M}\mu_0 a$, $E(\text{right boundary}) = -\mathcal{M}\mu_0 a$, with $E(R) = 0$ otherwise. This model was introduced by us to study the effect of screening currents on the nucleation of giant Shapiro Steps [24] and magnetic properties of JJA [22].

Model C includes the *full-range* inductance matrix in the calculations. We model $L(R,R')$ in this case by taking into account the local geometry of the junctions in the diagonal and mutual inductance contributions, as specified in Eq(32), using the filamentary wire approximation for the remaining terms. We model $E(R)$ in this case by an evaluation of Eq. (26) in the filamentary approximation. The inclusion of the full-range inductance matrix in the study of JJA was first considered by Phillips *et al* [25], who developed an efficient algorithm to study static vortex properties in JJA. Also Reinel *et al.*[27] recently implemented a full inductance matrix approach to calculate static properties, somewhat closer in spirit to the method we implemented to study the dynamics response of the JJA. More recently Phillips *et al.*[26] have extended their static approach to study the dynamic response of JJA. We will compare our results for models A through C to theirs where appropriate. We have also studied the dynamical magnetic properties of Model C[23]. Here we concentrate on the study of the coherent vortex oscillating states of model C, which lead to screening-induced fractional giant Shapiro steps.

Note that the essential difference between models A,B and C is that the former assumes that the magnetic field lines are constrained to lie on the plane while the latter takes fully into account the three dimensionality of the physical problem. Of course, the complexity of the algorithms needed to solve the dynamical equations

grows with the range of the inductance matrix. We do not discuss the specific details of the implementation of these algorithms, which can be found in Ref. [23], but will instead concentrate on discussing the corresponding results for models A through C.

4.3. Linearized equation results

Before we discuss the numerical results obtained for models A through C we note that there is useful physical information that can be extracted from the linearized approximation to the JJA equations. Including screening current effects leads to a finite London penetration depth λ_L. The linear approximation of the Josephson term in the stationary limit of Eq.(27) leads to the London equation for $\Phi(R)$ in a square lattice [22,23]. In this case one can define an effective penetration depth that depends on the specific model for $L(R, R')$. In the local approximation of models A and B the penetration depth is

$$\lambda_J = \sqrt{\frac{\Phi_0 a}{2\pi I_0 \mu_0 \bar{\Lambda}}}, \tag{35}$$

with $\bar{\Lambda}$ an effective inductance, $\bar{\Lambda} = \Lambda_0$ in model A and $\bar{\Lambda} = \Lambda_0 - 4\mathcal{M}$ in model B. Since the lattice constant a plays the role of a coherence length in the JJA, we can define a κ_J-parameter

$$\kappa_J = \frac{\lambda_J}{a} = \sqrt{\frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi I_0 \mu_0 a \bar{\Lambda}}} = \sqrt{\frac{\nu_\Phi}{\nu_\theta \bar{\Lambda}}}. \tag{36}$$

For finite range inductance matrices, one can calculate a demagnetization factor d in the array. Here d is defined by the difference between the external and internal magnetic fields $\Delta H = -dM$ with $d = -\frac{1}{L(R,R)} \sum_{R' \neq R} L(R, R')$, and the total magnetization M is proportional to $\sum_R J(R)$. In an external field the array behaves as if having an effective self-inductance $\bar{\Lambda} = (1 - d)\Lambda_0$. In the diagonal case $d = 0$, while in model B, $d = 4\mathcal{M}/\Lambda_0$. In the thermodynamic limit $d \to 1$. One can show[23] that, within the linearized local approximations, for models A and B the effective vortex-vortex interaction energy (neglecting the lattice pinning potential) goes like

$$\mathcal{U}(\rho) = \pi E_J [\ln \frac{\lambda_J}{\rho} + \ln 2 - \gamma] \quad \text{for } \rho \ll \lambda_J, \tag{37}$$

with γ Euler's constant and

$$\mathcal{U}(\rho) = \pi E_J \frac{e^{-\rho/\lambda_J}}{\sqrt{2\pi\rho/\lambda_J}} \quad \text{for } \rho \gg \lambda_J \tag{38}$$

with $\rho = |R - R'|$ the distance between two vortices, and the Josephson energy $E_J = \frac{\Phi_0 I_0}{2\pi}$.

As was found originally by Pearl [44] for thin films, when considering model C, the long range screening currents affect the effective penetration depth and the long

range vortex-vortex interactions. From linearizing Eq.(27), in the static limit, one gets[23,25,45]

$$\lambda_p = \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi I_0 \mu_0} \tag{39}$$

with the corresponding κ-parameter,

$$\kappa_p = \frac{\lambda_p}{a} = \frac{\Phi_0}{2\pi I_0 \mu_0 a} = \frac{\nu_\Phi}{\nu_\theta} \, . \tag{40}$$

In this case the effective vortex-vortex interaction energy is[23],

$$\mathcal{U}(\rho) = \pi E_J [\ln \frac{\lambda_p}{\rho} + \ln 2 - \gamma] \quad \text{for} \;\; \rho \ll \lambda_p, \tag{41}$$

while

$$\mathcal{U}(\rho) = \pi E_J \frac{\lambda_p}{\rho} \quad \text{for} \;\; \rho \gg \lambda_p. \tag{42}$$

Here we see that $\mathcal{U}(\rho)$ has a slower decrease with ρ than the one given in Eq.(38). This ρ dependence was found in the static numerical calculations of Phillips *et al.* [25], and it is equivalent to the one found in thin films [44].

We see then that the main difference between models A and B, in the way we have defined them, is that model A does not include edge magnetic fields and model B does, but both have the same long range vortex-vortex interactions. In contrast, although models B and C both include edge magnetic fields, their corresponding long range vortex-vortex interactions are different.

As we shall discuss further in this review, by considering models A through C we can study the effects of having local screening, long-range screening, and antisymmetric edge magnetic fields independently. Of course in real experimental samples, in principle, it is the full inductance matrix plus the antisymmetric edge magnetic fields that we should take into account as emphasized by Phillips *et al.* [26].

In this review we concentrate on the dynamic properties of inductive JJA. It is of interest, however, to mention here the results we have also obtained for the static magnetic and transport properties of inductive JJA as a function of κ (either κ_J or κ_p) for models A through C [22,23]. We can separate the results between extreme Type I ($\kappa \ll 1$) and Type II ($\kappa \gg 1$) regimes. There is a crossover $\kappa \equiv \kappa_x (\sim 1)$ that separates these two extreme regimes. The $\kappa > \kappa_x$ regime shows a Meissner-like state for $f < f_{c1}$, with the characteristic field $f_{c1} < 1$, and it has a vortex lattice for $f > f_{c1}$. The vortex lattices resemble the ones that appear in the ground states of the extreme Type II regime ($\kappa \to \infty$). For $\kappa < \kappa_x$ there is Type I-like behavior. For $f < f_{c0}$, with $f_{c0} > 1$, the ground state is a Meissner state. For larger fields $f > f_{c0}$, the field penetrates the array from the boundaries of the array in the form of "vortex collars" with constant vorticity. The vortices attract each other to form the collars [22,23]. We stress that the qualitative physical aspects of the two extreme regimes are independent of the specific inductance model considered. The difference appears in the form of the long-range vortex-vortex interaction which is

generally only relevant for low vortex concentrations. The quantitative differences arise mainly in the specific values of the critical fields f_{c1}, f_{c0}, and the crossover screening parameter κ_x [23]. In the study of the subharmonic giant Shapiro steps the two physically extreme regimes lead to fractional giant steps in the IV characteristics with completely different underlying vortex dynamics.

5. GIANT SUBHARMONIC SHAPIRO STEPS WITH SCREENING

5.1. Coherent vortex oscillating states with local inductance matrices

In this subsection we present the results obtained from simulations of a periodic JJA described by Eq. (28), with inductance matrices given by models A or B. Here we concentrate in the zero field case ($f = 0$) for the same parameters used in Sec. 3.2. In this case the dynamical equations were integrated using a second order Runge-Kutta method with fixed step $\Delta t = 0.02 - 0.1\tau$, with τ the smallest of the characteristic times $\tau_\theta (= 1/\nu_\theta)$ or $\tau_\Phi (= 1/\nu_\Phi)$. After discarding the results from the first 100 periods of the ac current, time averages were carried out for time intervals of, typically, up to 500 periods.

The study of model A with $f = 0$ leads to results entirely equivalent to the one junction case, i.e. the IV characteristics present only integer giant Shapiro steps. Significant changes occur, however, when rational frustrations are applied to the array (see Section 5.3).

The situation for model B with $f = 0$ is completely different. We studied the response of the inductive JJA as a function of κ_J, fixing $\mathcal{M}/\Lambda_0 = 0.1$ (i.e. $d = 0.4$), and we found that for all the values of κ_J considered **there are** half-integer GSS. This appears to happen as soon as $\mathcal{M} \neq 0$ (i.e. whenever $E(R) \neq 0$). Therefore, the presence of the edge magnetic field term is necessary to induce subharmonic steps in the IVs. From an analysis of a visual animation of the vortex dynamics, we found that the edge magnetic fields are the basic source of VAPs that are then responsible for the existence of 1/2-steps in the IV characteristics.

In Fig. 8 we show the half-integer steps in the IV curves for model B in the two different regimes of κ_J. Fig 8(a) has $\kappa_J = 2.27$, which corresponds to a moderate Type II regime. The results in Fig 8(a) are similar to the ACVS results, obtained when $\kappa = \infty$, in that they are hysteretic and the 1/2-step width is about the same size in both cases, for the same parameter values.

Fig.8(b) shows our I vs V results when $\kappa_J = 0.44$, i.e. in Type I regime. Again, there is a 1/2-step but with a hysteresis loop significantly reduced as compared to the one for $\kappa_J = 2.27$. Furthermore, there is clear evidence of a 2/3-step in the IV, but with larger step width than in the $\kappa = \infty$ case and for a smaller lattice size (40×40).

In Fig. 9 we show the change in the 1/2-step width ($f = 0$) as a function of $1/\kappa_J$. The $\kappa_J = \infty$ point, denoted as ACVS, was generated by including the edge magnetic fields as boundary conditions in the RSJ JJA equations (See Sec 3.5). For

finite κ_J we can distinguish three qualitatively different regimes in Fig. 9. (i) the Type II regime, where the 1/2-step width remains essentially constant and equal to the $\kappa = \infty$ result. (ii) the Type I regime where the step width first *increases* and then (iii) decreases. The decrease occurs when the characteristic frequency $\nu_{_\Phi} < \nu$. This means that the current distributions are not able to follow the rapid oscillations due to the external current drive, and thus the coherent vortex oscillating state is less stable.

We now move to discuss the microscopic coherent vortex patterns responsible for the 1/2-steps in model B as a function of κ_J. Typical examples of the family of oscillating coherent vortex states found in our studies of model B are shown in Fig. 10. In Fig. 10(a) we show results for $\kappa_J = 2.27$ ($f = 0$). The oscillating vortex configurations consist of columns of mostly **isolated** unit charge positive and negative vortices with period $2/\nu$. As κ_J decreases from $\kappa_J = \infty$ to a finite value, $1 < \kappa_J << \infty$, the ACVS angle for the symmetry axis changes until it becomes collinear with the direction of the external current (compare with Fig. 6(a)). When $\kappa_J < 1$, there are two distinct 1/2-step vortex oscillatory patterns one for $\nu < \nu_\Phi$ (ii) and the other for $\nu > \nu_\Phi$ (iii). In case (ii) the vortex columns are generated at the sample edges and then move towards the center of the array where they collide creating and annihilating individual vortices that concentrate about the center of the array. An instantaneous vortex pattern for $\kappa_J = 0.44$ is shown in Fig. 10(b). In the regime where $\nu > \nu_\Phi$, the induced currents can not follow the applied current. Then the vortex columns, nucleated at the sample edges, do not have enough time to collide with each other while still oscillating back and forth with period two. This situation is shown in Fig. 10(c) for $\kappa_J = 0.29$. In all cases considered, during the transient regime, VAPs are nucleated at the boundaries due to the presence of the antisymmetric edge-fields. But they do not correspond to the nucleation of *commensurate* vortex states as was suggested in the qualitative explanation of Ref. [15].

The difference in the coherent vortex patterns from the ACVS of Fig. 6(a) to the vortex stripes of Figs. 10(c) is due to the change in the long-range interaction between vortices, purely logarithmic in the non inductive ACVS to the exponential decay in model B given in Eq(38), with the κ_J-dependent characteristic decay length from Eq(39). Of significant importance is the sign of the vortex interactions going from being repulsive for $\kappa_J = \infty$ to attractive for $\kappa_J < 1$ (when compared to the lattice pinning potential [23]).

5.2. Coherent vortex oscillating states with full inductance matrix

In this section we discuss our results from including the full-range inductance matrix in the analysis, within our model C approximation. This is a problem that has also recently been studied by Phillips *et al.* [26], and we will make comparisons between our results and theirs where appropriate. We are also interested in comparing the results discussed in this section with those of the previous section. In particular we want to find out how important is the form of the vortex interaction

at large distances, which is where the differences between model B and C arise, in the formation of coherent oscillating vortex patterns in zero magnetic field.

In Fig. 11 we show our results including the full inductance matrix of model C, with $\kappa_p = 2$ and for a 24×24 lattice. The driving ac current and frequency are the same as in the previous cases. The numerical integration of the dynamical equations is done following the same approach with time step of $\Delta t = 0.1\tau_\theta$. In this case we discarded the first 20 periods of the driving current and carried out time averages over 80 periods. In Fig. 11 we see a clearly developed hysteretic half-integer Shapiro step. If we compare this IV with the one shown in Fig. 8(a), for $\kappa_J = 2.27$ and only nearest neighbours inductance, we see that the 1/2-step width is larger in this case. As mentioned before, the calculations with the full inductance matrix are more demanding than those of model B and thus we were not able to do a comprehensive study of the IV steps as a function of κ_p, as was done in Fig. 9 for model B.

The important aspects of Fig. 11 are that: there is clearly a 1/2-step, there is hysteresis, although its size is intermediate between the $\kappa_J \gg 1$ and $\kappa_J < 1$ cases, and the non hysteretic part of the 1/2-step is larger than in model B. These results indicate that the presence of antisymmetric edge-fields ($E(R) \neq 0$), either modelled by B or C, is responsible for nucleating the coherent vortex states that lead to 1/2-steps in the IV's. To further check the relevance of the edge fields, we set $E(R) = 0$ in Eq. (28) and calculated the corresponding IV. The results for model C are shown in Fig. 11 with a dotted line, using the same κ_p and current parameters as before. We clearly see no evidence for a 1/2-step. Instead, the IV curve corresponds to the single junction solution times N_y.

There are differences between models B and C in the specific vortex patterns formed, as we can see in Fig. 12. This is not only because the long-range interactions between vortices are different, but also because for model C the antisymmetric edge-fields are non-zero throughout the sample (in which case the strict meaning of "edge-fields" loses its value.) Fig. 12(a) shows the rows of isolated vortex and antivortex patterns for $\kappa_p = 20$, as in model B. This coherent vortex state oscillates with period $2/\nu$, with vortices and antivortices interchanging their respective positions after each period $T = 1/\nu$. Note that the vortices have a wavy pattern with a tendency to form an angle remarkably resembling the one existing in the ACVS at $\kappa = \infty$. In Fig. 12(b) we show the vortex pattern for $\kappa_p = 2$. We see that there is one row of vortices and one of antivortices, which oscillate with period $2/\nu$. After one period T, the rows move back and forth towards the center of the array, but they do not interchange positions. In Fig. 12(c) we show the vortex state for $\kappa_p = 0.1$. In this case the large screening makes the $E(R)$ contribution dominant (the magnitude of E grows as $1/\kappa_p$). In this figure we see that there are curved edge-field induced rows of vortices (from the left) and antivortices (from the right). Only in the center of the array can we distinguish some isolated vortices and antivortices. This coherent vortex state also oscillates with period $2/\nu$. After one period $T = 1/\nu$, the edge field induced vortex rows oscillate back and forth

(without changing sign), whereas the isolated vortices and antivortices close to the center interchange their respective positions. This behavior is similar to the one seen in Fig. 10(b), but here the edge-field induced vortex rows occupy most of the sample. However, since the edge magnetic fields are size dependent, we expect that in real arrays (which are 1000×1000), the central region with the oscillating vortices will be bigger.

5.3. Fractional giant Shapiro steps with screening

We now proceed to discuss the effects of screening in the stability of the field induced fractional giant Shapiro steps for $f = p/q$ [24]. In Sec. 2.3 we discussed the $\kappa = \infty$ case where the driven JJA shows giant fractional voltage steps given in Eq(13). The existence of the FGSS is due to the collective oscillation between the different ground state vortex configurations with frequency ν/q [6,7,8,9]. The question that naturally arises is what will happen when there is large screening, i.e. $\kappa < 1$, for the ground state now is a Meissner state [22,23].

In this case, as we show below, we found that it was enough to use the diagonal inductance, model A, to simulate the JJA dynamics. The fields considered were $f = 1/3$ and $1/2$. We note that the external field induces high vortex concentrations, that in turn make the effect of antisymmetric edge-fields and differences in the long-range vortex interactions less relevant. In Figs. 13(a) and 13(b) we show the IV results for model A, for a lattice with 40×40 sites and $f = 1/3$. Fig. 13(a) shows the results for $\kappa_J = 2.27$, while Fig. 13(b) has $\kappa_J = 0.44$. It is clear from these results that in both limits the IV's show giant Shapiro steps at $1/3$ and $1/2$ fractions. We note that in the $\kappa_J > 1$ regime there is a small $1/2$-step, as was found in the $\kappa = \infty$ case using free end boundary conditions (Lee and Stroud [7]). For $\kappa_J < 1$ the $1/2$-step is much bigger. There are also higher harmonics seen in Fig. 13(b) that we have not highlighted in the figure for clarity. Fig. 13(c) shows the results for model B for the same parameters as in Fig. 13(b) and with $d = 0.4$. A comparison between Figs. 13(b) and (c) shows that qualitatively there are no significant differences.

Fig. 14 shows the widths of the FGSS for $f = 1/3$ for steps at $1/3, 2/3$ and $1/2$, plotted as a function of $1/\kappa_J$. For comparison, in Fig. 14 we also show the results for the $1/2$-step width with $f = 1/2$ as a function of κ_J. Again, we distinguish three qualitatively different κ_J-regimes in this figure. (i) The Type II regime where the step width is constant and equal to the $\kappa_J = \infty$ result; the Type I regime where the step width (ii) increases initially and then (iii) decreases. The decrease also occurs when the characteristic frequency $\nu_\Phi < \nu$. As mentioned before the $FGSS$ in the $\kappa = \infty$ limit were explained in terms of a coherent oscillation of the ground state vortex lattices formed when $I^{ext} = 0$ [6,7,8,9]. When screening is included the vortex lattice configurations get modified. In Fig. 15 we show the instantaneous vortex configurations at the $1/2$-step in the $f = 1/2$ case, both in the Type II and Type I cases. In Fig. 15(a) we took $\kappa_J = 2.27$, and the vortex state shown in the figure oscillates with period $2/\nu$. We notice that there are remanents of the ground states present in the $\kappa = \infty$ limit but now forming "clusters" separated by

"Bloch" or "soliton" surface walls due to the screening currents. The size of the "cluster" regions in this particular case is about $\ell = 7a$ while the Bloch wall is $2a$. As $\kappa_J \to \kappa_x$, with $\kappa_x \leq 1$ the number of Bloch walls increases, and for $\kappa_J < \kappa_x$ we notice the merging of vortices into the stripes shown in Fig.15(b). For $\kappa_J = 0.44$. This structure is reminiscent of the intermediate state in a bulk superconductor, although the structure discussed here is generated dynamically. The 1/2-step in the IV-characteristics corresponds to a coherent oscillation of this stripped vortex distribution that oscillates between +1 and zero vorticities with period $2/\nu$. In the Type I regime with $I^{ext} = 0$, the equilibrium magnetic field distributions correspond to the Meissner state [22,23]. Starting from this state and turning on the external $I^{ext}(t)$ current, the induced Lorentz force "pulls" the flux into the sample and, after a transient, the vortex distributions settles into the final oscillating stripped configuration. This is shown in Fig. 16 for $f = 1/3$, within the 1/3-step.

In both Type I and Type II limits, the oscillating vortex states are non-equilibrium stationary states. In the Type II regime the oscillating vortex lattice, even when similar to the ground state of the $\kappa_J = \infty$ case, is different because of the screening induced defects. The vortex state without external driving, $I^{ext} = 0$, forms a lattice but with a density of vortices smaller than the external field density $f = p/q$, because there is now a finite penetration depth [22,23]. On the other hand, the oscillating vortex state at the fractional steps, has a vortex density exactly equal to $f = p/q$, so that it can oscillate with frequency ν/q. Only in the $\kappa = \infty$ limit both the oscillating vortex state and the ground state coincide. In the Type I regime, as it was mentioned before, the difference is more explicit. Whereas the ground state is the Meissner state, without vortices, the oscillating vortex state is the "intermediate" state shown in Fig. 15(b) and Fig. 16(d).

Although we did not carry out calculations for $f = p/q$ with model C we do not expect significant qualitative changes as compared to the picture presented above, since for high vortex concentrations we have not found significant differences between models A and C in the static case [23].

5.4. Magnetic field dependence of half-integer Shapiro steps

In the experiments by H. C. Lee *et al.* [15] it was found that the 1/2-steps exist not only for zero field, but also for any finite value of f. As we discussed above, we have found that as long as we include the antisymmetric edge-fields, represented by a $E(R) \neq 0$, there are 1/2-steps in the IV's for all the values of f considered. In Fig. 17 we show the step width of the 1/2-integer step as a function of f both for a Type II ($\kappa_J = 2.27$) and Type I cases ($\kappa_J = 0.44$). In this case we simulated model B with $d = 0.4$. In the Type II case the curve shows more structure than in the Type I regime. Also, in the Type II regime the 1/2-step width close to $f = 0$ tends to go to zero for small fields. Moreover, when the ACVS is induced by disorder ($\kappa = \infty$) we found that the 1/2-step disappears for fields smaller than $f = 0.05$. What is qualitatively important is that in both regimes the curves have maxima at $f = 0$ and $f = 0.5$, as observed in the experiments [15]. The relative height of the

two maxima depends on the frequency and amplitude of the ac current.

Although all the results presented above are $T = 0$ results, we have verified that they are stable at sufficiently low temperatures.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The central theme of this review was the search for a microscopic understanding of the different types of steps that can be found in the IV characteristics of driven proximity effect Josephson junction arrays (JJA). The motivation for this work started with the experimental findings of giant integer ($f = 0$) and fractional ($f = p/q$) Shapiro steps [5,6] (GSS), that were theoretically explained in terms of an extreme Type II RSJ model [7,8,9]. The dynamical equations of motion describing the JJA are equivalent to a large set of overdamped nonlinear coupled equations driven by an external time-dependent current. However, in the $f = 0$ case the array behaves as a set of single junctions connected in series, and thus the GSS are simply a manifestation of the Shapiro steps of each junction. Note that if we were discussing the underdamped limit of a single junction extra subharmonic states would appear. When $f = p/q$ the steps seen in the IV's are due to a coherent oscillation of the ground state vortex lattice [6,7].

Experimentally, there are fractional giant Shapiro steps in zero field that do not conform to the picture given above[6,15,16,17]. In order to shed light into this problem we decided to study the effects of disorder in a driven JJA modeled by the RSJ model in zero field and $\kappa = \infty$ [18,19,20]. We discovered that as soon as we break translational invariance the corresponding IV's show half-integer GSS. When looking in more detail at the corresponding microscopic vortex dynamics, we found a stationary coherent oscillatory vortex pattern with completely unexpected properties. We termed this novel state *axisymmetric coherent vortex state* (ACVS), which characterizes its geometric nature. We have carried out a comprehensive analysis of the stability properties of the ACVS against variations of several physical parameters. We have concluded that the ACVS is in fact a very stable global attractor of the nonlinear dynamics, that can be generated in several different ways. The only essential element needed to nucleate the ACVS, however, is to have a mechanism that produces a vortex antivortex pair (VAP) in the initial conditions.

Unfortunately, we still do not have a complete theoretical understanding of the ACVS, in particular, the "radiation" and annihilation mechanisms that are essential for its formation and stability. The VAP radiation phenomenon, due to the presence of the ac current, does not appear to have been studied before. Furthermore, we would like to understand why the ACVS forms in the very specific patterns shown in the figures. Note that the ACVS is a true nonequilibrium state that disappears as soon as we turn off both the dc and/or ac currents. This property seems to imply that the ACVS can not be explained from a minimum energy principle. This is a fundamental difference between the ACVS and the fractional GSS observed with $f = p/q$.[7,8,9]

Most of the experiments that show GSS were made in proximity effect arrays,

with large screening currents. We began the study of self-field effects in JJA by considering local screening models for the inductance matrix[24]. There we found that there are new fractional GSS triggered by the current induced antisymmetric magnetic edge-fields. We found that there is a robust 1/2-step in the IV's even when $f = 0$, and similar to what was seen in the experiments.

Recently, Phillips *et al.* [25] and Reinel *et al.* [27] have extended the static analysis including the full inductance matrix, and then Phillips *et al.* [26] extended our dynamic study including the full inductance matrix. The inductance matrix model used by Phillips *et al.* takes fully into account the specific geometry of typical SIS arrays. The local geometry of these arrays is quantitatively different from the SNS junctions used in the study of GSS [6,15,16,17]. However, their results must be semi-quantitatively correct, in particular at long distances.

In this review we have presented our own full inductance matrix results within the filamentary approximation. We have discussed the main differences between local screening models (A and B) and the full inductance model (C). Models A and B differ in that model A does not include "edge-fields" ($E(R) = 0$) while model B does ($E(R) \neq 0$). Nonetheless, as shown in Section 4.3, both models have, within the linearized approximation of the equations of motion, the same long distance vortex-vortex (V-V) interaction potential. On the other hand, models B and C have different long distance V-V interaction potential. In model B the V-V interaction decays exponentially with distance, while in model C it decays algebraically. Nevertheless, both models include the "edge-fields" (quantitatively the range of $E(R)$ depends on the range of $L(R, R')$.)

From our comparisons of the three inductance matrix models, the following picture emerges:

(i) The existence of the subharmonic GSS at $f = 0$ is due to the presence of current induced antisymmetric magnetic fields, which break the translational symmetry. In fact, when we artificially imposed $E(R) = 0$ in model C, we did not obtain a subharmonic response, despite of the fact that the long range V-V interactions were properly taken into account. Instead, we get the single junction type IV (see Fig. 11.)

(ii) The specific structure of the underlying coherent oscillating vortex states and their corresponding subharmonic step widths, depend directly on the long range V-V interactions (as also found by Phillips *et al.*.) We found that as the screening parameter κ decreases, there is a whole family of coherent oscillating vortex states where the vortex rows tend to line up with the external current, for a given inductance model. For κ larger than the crossover $\kappa_x(\sim 1)$, the V-V interaction is repulsive while for $\kappa \leq \kappa_x$ it is attractive. This explains why the vortex patterns in the former case contain isolated vortices while in the latter the vortices form stripes of constant vorticity. Also, the geometric vortex patterns depend on the model used to describe the inductance matrix for a given κ, which is connected to the difference in the nature of the V-V interaction.

In all the cases studied (either with $f = 0$ or $f = p/q$) the coherent vortex

states are a fundamentally non-equilibrium consequence of the dynamics, with the only exception being the particular case of $\kappa = \infty$ and $f = p/q$. We believe that these non-equilibrium coherent vortex states, due to the breaking of translational invariance, are the underlying mechanism behind all the fractional giant Shapiro steps observed in *two-dimensional* SNS JJA. At $f = p/q$ this translational symmetry is broken by the applied magnetic field, that generates higher order periodicity thus leading to *fractional* GSS. At $f = 0$ the translational symmetry can be broken either by defects or by the current induced antisymmetric magnetic fields. They tend to nucleate vortex-antivortex pairs that produce ACVS-like vortex patterns responsible for the *subharmonic* GSS. Fractional steps can also be generated in lower dimensional systems by breaking translational invariance (e.g. ladder arrays and single plaquettes [46,47,48,49]).

The subharmonic GSS studied here correspond to fully overdamped JJA. It is known that underdamped single Josephson junctions can have subharmonic Shapiro steps and even chaos [50]. In fact, some chaotic phenomena has been recently studied in ac driven underdamped JJA [51]. It would be interesting also to know the effect of a finite capacitance (but not large enough to induce chaos) in these coherent vortex states, together with a finite vortex mass and the effects of the non-linear vortex viscosity [52].

We also want to mention other possibly related systems, like charge density waves [53] and the Frenkel-Kontorova model [54], where subharmonic Shapiro steps have been found as a consequence of the collective nonlinear dynamics of these systems.

How can the presence of a specific coherent oscillatory vortex state be verified experimentally? There are several possibilities but we will only mention the ones that are closest to the JJA system. Recently, many different techniques have been developed for doing spatially resolved measurements in JJA [55,56,57,58] (save for Tonomura's *al.* approach[59].) Most of these techniques, however, are dedicated to the study of *static* flux configurations [55,56,57]. Lachenmann *et al* [58] have been able to study *dynamic* states in JJA by the using the low temperature scanning electron microscopy (LTSEM) technique. These are basically measurements of the local distribution of dissipation produced by the local heating of the LTSEM tip, that in turn gives the average junction voltage in the arrays. Since a moving vortex generates a voltage as it crosses a junction, this type of measurement indicates the location of the vortices during their oscillations (note that since this process is independent of the sign of the vorticity, it will not average to zero after many ACVS ac current periods.) In fact, in Fig. 18, we show a simulation of the average voltage along the current direction for the ACVS at a finite temperature. There we see where the vortices were located most of the time regardless of their sign. In particular, the characteristic angle of the ACVS is clear. Therefore, an LTSEM based measurement may be able to provide evidence for the formation of an ACVS.

In conclusion, we have shown that giant subharmonic steps in the IV characteristics can be generated under many different circumstances at zero and non-zero

external magnetic field, but for which the underlying microscopic vortex dynamics can be fundamentally different. In all the cases considered, at least for two dimensional SNS arrays, the steps appear to always entail a microscopic coherent oscillating vortex state.

We do not as yet have a more theoretical understanding of all the nonlinear mechanisms responsible for the formation of all these coherent vortex states and further studies are needed to shed light on these questions.

Acknowledgments

We thank A. Karma and C. Wiecko for their collaboration in the initial stages of our ACVS studies. Fruitful discussions with H. van der Zant, R. Markiewicz, J. E. van Himbergen, M. Rzchowski, D. Stroud, A. Majhofer, T. Hagenaars, P. Tiesinga, and L.L. Sohn are gratefully acknowledged. One of us (JVJ) thanks the Instituut voor Theoretische Fysica, Universiteit Utrecht, The Netherlands, for its kind hospitality during his 93-94 sabbatical leave, specially J. E. van Himbergen. We thank the *NSF* grant DMR-9211339, the Pittsburgh supercomputing center under grant PHY88081P, the Donors of the Petroleum Research Fund, under grant ACS-PRF#22036-AC6, and the ICTP, Trieste, for partial support of this research. D.D. was also supported by a fellowship from CONICET, Argentina.

References

1. For recent reviews see, *Proceedings of the 2nd CTP Workshop on Statistical Physics: KT Transition and Superconducting Arrays*, Edited by D. Kim, *et al.* (Min Eum Sa, Seoul, Korea, 1993).
2. For a review see C. D. Lobb, Physica (Amsterdam) **126B& C**, 319 (1989).
3. J. S. Chung, K. H. Lee, and D. Stroud, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 6570 (1989); K. K. Mon and S. Teitel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 673 (1989); F. Falo, A. R. Bishop and P. S. Lomdahl, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 10983 (1990).
4. H. Eikmans and J. E. van Himbergen, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 8927 (1990).
5. T. D. Clark, Phys. Rev. B **8**, 137 (1973). Ch. Leeman, Ph. Lerch, and P. Martinoli, Physica (Amsterdam) **126B**, 475 (1984);
6. (a) S. P. Benz, M. S. Rzchowski, M. Tinkham, and C. J. Lobb, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 693 (1990). (b) S. P. Benz, Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University, (1990). (unpublished).
7. K. H. Lee, D. Stroud, and J. S. Chung, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 692 (1990); K. H. Lee and D. Stroud, Phys. Rev. B **43**,5280 (1991).
8. J. U. Free, S. P. Benz, M. S. Rzchowski, M. Tinkham, C. J. Lobb, and M. Octavio, Phys. Rev. B **41**,7267 (1990); M. Octavio, J. U. Free, S. P. Benz, R. S. Newrock, D. B. Mast, and C. J. Lobb, *ibid* **44**,4601 (1991).
9. M. Kvale and S. E. Hebboul, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 3720 (1991); M. S. Rzchowski, L. L. Sohn, and M. Tinkham, *ibid* **43**, 8682 (1991); M. Y. Choi, *ibid* **B46**, 564 (1992).
10. L. L. Sohn, M. S. Rzchowski, J. U. Free, S. P. Benz, M. Tinkham, and C. J. Lobb, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 925 (1991); L. L. Sohn, M. S. Rzchowski, J. U. Free, M. Tinkham, and C. J. Lobb, *ibid* **45**, 3003 (1992).
11. T. C. Halsey, Phys. Rev. B **B 41**, 11634(1990). S. J. Lee and T.C. Halsey, *ibid* **47**, 5133 (1993).
12. H. Eikmans and J. E. van Himbergen, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 6937 (1991).

13. G. Chu and J. V. José, Phys. Rev. Phys. Rev. **B47** (RC), 8365 (1993) for a JJA necklace and Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. **38**, 837 (1993), and to be published for a diagonal lattice.
14. S. P. Benz and C. J. Burroughs, Appl. Phys. Lett. **58**, 2162 (1991); and Supercond. Sci. Technol. **4**, 561 (1991).
15. H. C. Lee, R. S. Newrock, D. B. Mast, S. E. Hebboul, J. C. Garland, and C. J. Lobb, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 921 (1991).
16. S. E. Hebboul and J. C. Garland, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 13703 (1991).
17. S. E. Hebboul and J. C. Garland, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 5190 (1993).
18. D. Domínguez, J. V. José, A. Karma, and C. Wiecko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2367 (1991).
19. D. Domínguez and J. V. José, in *IV International Workshop on Instabilities and Non-Equilibrium Structures*, Valparaiso, Chile (1991); J. V. José, D. Domínguez and G. Chu, Proceedings of *2nd. CTP Workshop: KT Transition and Superconducting Arrays*, edited by D. Kim, J. S. Chung, and M. Y. Choi (Seoul 1993), p.p. 37.
20. D. Domínguez and J. V. José, Phys. Rev. **B48**, 13717 (1993).
21. W. Xia and P. L. Leath, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1428 (1989); P. L. Leath and W. Xia, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 9619 (1991).
22. D. Domínguez and J. V. José, Bull. Am. Phys. Soc. **37**, 61 (1991).
23. D. Domínguez and J. V. José, to be published.
24. D. Domínguez and J. V. José, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 514 (1992).
25. J. R. Phillips, H. S. J. van der Zant, J. White, and T. P. Orlando, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 5219 (1993).
26. J. R. Phillips, H. S. J. van der Zant, J. White, and T. P. Orlando, (preprint).
27. D. Reinel, W. Dieterich, T. Wolf and A. Majhofer, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 9118 (1994), and private communications with A. Majhofer.
28. D. E. McCumber, J. Appl. Phys. **39**, 3113 (1968); W. C. Stewart, Appl. Phys. Lett. **10**, 277 (1968).
29. S. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **11**, 80 (1963)
30. H. S. Greenside and E. Helfand, Bell. Syst. Tech. J. **60**, 1927 (1981).
31. J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, J. Phys. C **6**, 1181 (1973). V. L. Berezinskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **61**, 1144 (1971), *ibid.* **59**, 907 (1970). J. V. José, L. P. Kadanoff, S. Kirkpatrick and D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. **B16**, 1217 (1977).
32. S. Teitel and C. Jayaprakash, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1999 (1983); T. C. Halsey, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 5728 (1985).
33. Note that in the experiments of Ref. [6,15,16,17] frequencies have been normalized by $\nu_c = \nu_0/2\pi$, therefore $\nu_{max} \approx 1.38\nu_c$ in their notation.
34. T. Van Duzer and C. Turner, *Principles of Superconductive Devices and Circuits* (Elsevier North Holland, New York, 1981)
35. It is worth to mention that Hebboul and Garland [17] have observed 1/2-steps only above a critical I_{ac} in their experiments. However, as we discuss later on in this article, it is more likely that in their case the subharmonic steps are due to the presence of antisymmetric current induced magnetic fields, instead of defects.
36. D. Domínguez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3096 (1994).
37. S. E. Hebboul, D. C. Harris, and J. C. Garland, Physica B **165& 166**, 1629 (1990).
38. C. W. Gear, *Numerical Initial Value Problems in Ordinary Differential Equations*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey (1971).
39. A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. G'orkov and I. Ye. Dzyalosinskii, *Quantum field theoretical methods in statistical physics*, second edition, p.p. 253. Pergamon Press, 1965, New York.

40. A. Majhofer, T. Wolf and W. Dieterich, Phys. Rev. **B44**, 9634 (1991).
41. J. Castro, private communication and Ph. D. thesis, Instituto Balseiro, Bariloche (1992).
42. K. Nakajima and Y. Sawada, J. App. Phys. **52**, 5732 (1981).
43. J. V. José and G. Chu Bull. Amer. Phys. Soc. **39**, 378 (1994) and to be published.
44. J. Pearl, Appl. Phys. Lett. **5**, 65 (1964).
45. C. J. Lobb, D. W. Abraham, and M. Tinkham, Phys. Rev. B **27**, 150 (1983).
46. W. Yu, E. B. Harris, S. E. Hebboul, J. C. Garland, and D. Stroud, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 12624 (1992).
47. J. Kim and H. J. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **47**, 582 (1993); J. Kim, H. J. Shin, H. J. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 6432 (1994).
48. J. Kim, W. G. Choe, S. Kim and H. J. Lee, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 459 (1994).
49. L. L. Sohn and M. Octavio, Phys. Rev. B **49**, 9236 (1994).
50. R. L. Kautz and R. Monaco, J. Appl. Phys. **57**, 875 (1985).
51. R. Bhagavatula, C. Ebner and C. Jayaprakash, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 4774 (1992); D. Domínguez and H. A. Cerdeira, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3359 (1993).
52. T. J. Hagenaars, P. H. E. Tiesinga, J. E. Van Himbergen, and J. V. José, Phys. Rev. **B** (July 1994).
53. A. A. Middleton, O. Biham, P. B. Littlewood, P. Sibani, Phys. Rev. Lett., **68**, 1586 (1992).
54. F. Falo, L. M. Floría, P. J. Martínez and J. J. Mazo, Phys. Rev. B **48**, 7434 (1993).
55. K. Runge and B. Pannetier, Europhys. Lett. **24**, 737 (1993).
56. L. N. Vu, M. S. Wistrom, and D. J. Van Harlingen, Appl. Phys. Lett. **63**, 1693 (1993).
57. H. D. Hallen, R. Seshadri, A. M. Chang, R. E. Miller, L. N. Pfeiffer, K. W. West, C. A. Murray, and H. F. Hess, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3007 (1993).
58. S. G. Lachenmann, T. Doderer, D. Hoffman, R. P. Huebener, P. A. A. Booi and S. P. Benz, Phys. Rev. B, to be published.
59. K. Harada, *et al.* Nature, **360**, 51 (1992).

7. Figure Captions

Figure 1: Schematic representation of a Josephson junction square array driven by an external current I. The sites denote superconducting islands and the crosses the junctions themselves.

Figure 2: Vortex configurations, for a 40×40 array with one defect, produced by a dc current with $f = 10$, $\delta_x = 0.1$, $\delta_y = 0$. The white and black squares denote -1 and $+1$ phase vorticity per plaquette (see Eq. (11)), respectively. No squares here means zero vorticity. For currents (a) $I_{dc} = 0.8I_0 < I_c = 0.84I_0$; (b) $I_{dc} = 0.87I_0 > I_c$.

Figure 3: IV characteristics for a 40×40 square array with $I_{ac} = I_0$, $\nu = 0.1\nu_0$ and pbc. (a) Ordered array; (b) array with one defect in the center of the lattice and $\delta_x = 0.1$, $\delta_y = 0$ and $f = 2$ (for clarity the IV curve is shifted by one unit); (c) blowup of (b) for an 80×80 array showing hysteretic behavior and a clear 2/3-step.

Figure 4: Step width for of the 1/2-step for arrays with one defect given by the same parameters as in Fig. 3(b). (a) As a function of the frequency, ($I_{ac} = I_0$); and (b) as a function of the ac current, ($\nu = 0.1\,\nu_0$).

Figure 5: Number of vortices as a function of time for an array with one defect and $I_{dc} = 0.586I_0$ (within the 1/2-integer step). The lattice size, frequency and ac current are the same as in Fig. 3 (b). (a) Absolute number of vortices $N_a(t)$; (b) total number of vortices $N_T(t)$. See text for definitions of t_d, t_{ACVS} and t_{off}. Here time is measured in units of $1/\nu_0$.

Figure 6: Axisymmetric coherent vortex states (ACVS). (a-b) Stationary oscillating vortex configuration for an ACVS in the 1/2-step, for the same parameter values as in Fig. 3(b) with $I_{dc} = 0.586I_0$. (c) ACVS configuration in the 2/3-step with $I_{dc} = 0.622I_0$ in an 80×80 lattice. We use the same conventions as in Fig. 2.

Figure 7: Vortex distributions showing an ACVS at a 1/2-integer step generated by antisymmetric edge-fields in a 64×64 lattice with $\gamma = 1$, $I_{ac} = I_0$, $\nu = 0.1\nu_0$ and $I_{dc} = 0.57I_0$. The notation is the same as in Fig. 2.

Figure 8: IV-characteristics for arrays with only nearest-neighbours inductance (model B): Here $f = 0$, $I_{a.c.} = I_0$, $\nu = 0.1\nu_\theta$, and $\mathcal{M} = 0.1\Lambda_0$ ($d = 0.4$), for 40×40 lattice size. (a) Type II array with $\kappa_J = 2.27$; (b) Type I array with $\kappa_J = 0.44$.

Figure 9: IV-step widths $\Delta I/I_0$ vs $1/\kappa_J$, for half-integer steps in zero field. $I_{a.c.} = I_0, \nu = 0.1\nu_\theta, \mathcal{M} = 0.1\Lambda_0$, and lattice size 40×40.

Figure 10: Instantaneous vortex configurations for 1/2-steps with $f = 0$ (model B). Same $\mathcal{M}$ and ac driving currents as in Fig. 9, and $I_{dc} = 0.61I_0$. (a) $\kappa_J = 2.27$; (b) $\kappa_J = 0.44$; and (c) $\kappa_J = 0.29$. We use the same conventions as in Fig. 2 to denote vorticity.

Figure 11: IV-characteristics of an array with full inductance matrix (model C): $\kappa_p = 2$, lattice size 24×24, $f = 0$, $I_{a.c.} = I_0$, and $\nu = 0.1\nu_\theta$. The dotted line corresponds to a simulation with the same model C inductance, same κ_p and applied currents, but without edge fields (i.e. imposing $E(R) = 0$ in Eq.(24)).

Figure 12: Instantaneous vortex configurations for 1/2-steps at $f = 0$, $I_{ac} = I_0$, $\nu = 0.1\nu_\theta$, and $I_{dc} = 0.59I_0$, for model C. (a) $\kappa_p = 20$; (b) $\kappa_p = 2$, (c) $\kappa_p = 0.1$. The same conventions to indicate vorticity as in Fig. 2 is used.

Figure 13: IV-characteristics for model A with $f = 1/3$, $I_{a.c.} = I_0$, and $\nu = 0.1\nu_\theta$, for lattice size 40×40. (a) Type II array with $\kappa_J = 2.27$; (b) Type I array with $\kappa_J = 0.44$; (c) The same as (b) including edge-fields (model B) with $\mathcal{M}/\Lambda_0 = 0.1$ ($d = 0.4$). The giant Shapiro steps at $n/3$ and $n/2$ are marked. Curves start about the same place and are displaced from each other for clarity.

Figure 14: IV-step widths, $\Delta I/I_c$ vs $1/\kappa_J$, for $I_{a.c.} = I_0, \nu = 0.1\nu_\theta$, diagonal inductance approximation (model A), and lattice size 40×40. Upper curve corresponds to 1/2-step for $f = 1/2$, while the three lower curves to 2/3-step, 1/3-step and 1/2-step with $f = 1/3$.

Figure 15: Instantaneous vortex configurations for 1/2-steps with $f = 1/2$, in the diagonal inductance approximation (model A). $I_{ac} = I_0$, $\nu = 0.1\nu_\theta$. (a) $\kappa_J = 2.27$ (Type II), with $I_{dc} = 0.4I_0$. (b) $\kappa_J = 0.44$ (Type I), with $I_{dc} = 0.6I_0$. White and

black squares indicate 0 and +1 phase vorticity per plaquette, respectively.

Figure 16: Transient time evolution for the vortex configurations at a 1/3-step for $f = 1/3$, in model A. Here, $I_{dc} = 0.45I_0$, $I_{ac} = I_0$, and $\nu = 0.1\nu_\theta$. The current is applied along the vertical direction. (a) Initial Meissner configuration (i.e. the ground state for $I_{ext} = 0$), (b) The first vortex row has penetrated the array. (c) Advancing front of vortex rows. (d) Final oscillating 1/3-period state of vortex rows. White and black squares indicate 0 and +1 phase vorticity per plaquette, respectively.

Figure 17: Current width of the 1/2-steps as a function of f (model B) for: (a) $\kappa_J = 2.27$ and (b) $\kappa_J = 0.44$. Same $\mathcal{M}$ and driving currents as in Fig. 9.

Figure 18: Time average of the voltage drop in each junction along the current direction. Contour plot for the case with $I_{dc} = 0.57I_0$, $I_{ac} = I_0$, $\nu = 0.1\nu_\theta$ (i.e. in the half-integer step), for a 40×40 lattice with $\kappa = \infty$ and finite temperature $k_BT = 0.01E_J$.